

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 and 27-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1 and 20 have been amended as shown at pages 2-7 of the Reply. In addition, claim 27 has been cancelled. Independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to address issues related to 35 U.S.C. §101. Furthermore, independent claim 20 has been amended to include a limitation from independent claim 1. As such, the claim amendments do not introduce new subject matter to the claims that would require a new search. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested to better position the application for allowance or appeal.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 20, 27, and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-9, 20, 27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action asserts that computer readable storage medium can be interpreted to include transmission mediums. It is well known to those skilled in the art that computer readable storage mediums are limited to physical mediums that are capable of storage. Furthermore, the term “storage” clearly limits the claim to mediums that are for storage and not for transmission. Transmission mediums are well known by those skilled in the art not to be storage mediums. In addition, the specification at page 35, lines 11-25 discloses well known examples of computer readable storage mediums. Transmission mediums are disclosed separately in the specification at page 36, lines 11-31. As such, applicants’ representative believes the claim language and specification fully support the interpretation that a computer readable storage medium excludes transmission mediums. However, independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to use language from the specification related to computer readable media and system memory. As such, the amended claims are directed to statutory subject matter and this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-19, 21-25, and 27-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-19, 21-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravets *et al.* (US 6,363,377) in view of Gottsman *et al.* (US 6,134,548) in view of Brown (US 6,405,192). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be

withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

A factfinder should be aware, of course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of arguments reliant upon *ex post* reasoning. See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) citing *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U. S. 1, 36 (warning against a "temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention in issue" and instructing courts to "guard against slipping into the use of hindsight" (quoting *Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co.*, 332 F. 2d 406, 412 (CA6 1964))).

The subject invention relates to enhancing the results of a query by employing user defined preferences against the query results. For example, query results can be examined semantically to identify user interests and a thumbnail summary can be generated. In another example, links within a query result can be examined for content type, such as text, images, and links. A percentage of content type as compared to the total of all content in the linked document can be conveyed to the user. The user can then employ this information to determine if following the link will provide value. A user looking for Picasso paintings may be inclined to follow a link that contains a high percentage of image content. Independent claim 1 recites ***user-dependent query result information including an indication of percentage of a content type as compared to total content within at least one linked document in the query result.***

As conceded in the Office Action, Kravets *et al.* (US 6,363,377) and Gottsman *et al.* fail to teach or suggest performing any analysis of links within the query results. Brown *et al.* is cited to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kravets *et al.* and Gottsman *et al.* However, contrary to assertions in the Office Action, the cited reference fails to provide any indication of percentage of the quantity of a single content type as ***compared to a total of all content*** in the linked document. Brown *et al.* discloses a query system that employs link analysis to identify query terms in linked documents that are of interest to a user. The section of prior art cited discloses an indicator providing a percentage of broken links compared to good links. The percentage is used as an indication of how dated a document has become. This does not provide an indication of percentage of links as compared to the total of all content within a linked

document. The Office Action dated October 20, 2008 cites column 8, line 46 to column 9, line 14 as teaching an indication of percentage of a content type as compared to total content within at least one linked document. On the contrary, this section merely states that a number of broken links in a page is a possible threshold for use in determining if a page gets altered. It does not state that the number of broken links as a percentage of the total content of the page is employed. The subject claims' teaching of a percentage indication of a particular content type as compared to the total of all content in the document provides the user with useful information regarding the quantity of types of content in the document. For example, if a web page document has a high percentage of content that is links as compared to the total content in the document, it can be indicative of a web page that is merely advertising. This percentage indication is clearly distinct from the ratio of broken links to good links provided in Brown *et al.* Using a more specific example, a web page may contain 10 items, 9 being links and 1 being an image. If the links were all good, then the cited reference would indicate a percentage of 0% because there are no broken links. On the other hand a percentage comparison of links versus total content may indicate 90%. This may provide an indication to a user that the web page is mostly advertising. There is no suggestion or teaching within Brown *et al.* of a percentage providing a comparison of a particular content type, for example image, text, or links, against the total of all content of a linked document. The percentage indication provided in the subject claim can provide a quick way for a user to determine the type of content in a linked document. The cited references do not teach or suggest ***user-dependent query result information including an indication of percentage of a content type as compared to total content within at least one linked document in the query result*** as recited in the subject claim.

Independent claim 10 recites *providing user-dependent query result information derived from the query result; the user-dependent query result information determined via client-side processing, the user-dependent query result information including a list of names of at least one of people or companies extracted from the at least one search result, each name includes one or more links to documents related to the person or company associated with the name.* The subject claim discloses extracting names of people and companies from a search result and providing a list of the names along with links to documents related to the people or companies represented by the names. This allows a user to easily obtain additional information on the people of companies by selecting a link. Kravets *et al.* discloses a system for organizing search

results in search queries and results into related clusters and provides a tool for tuning a query to be more narrow or broader. Brown, *et al.* discloses a system for parsing search results based upon user specified criteria. The Office Action cites Gottsman, *et al.* as making up for the deficiencies of Kravets *et al.* and Brown, *et al.* Specifically Figure 9 and column 9, line 60 to column 10, line 10 are cited. On the contrary, this merely shows a thumbnail image of a search result next to the link to search result in the search result list. The thumbnail has a colored border around it indicating if it contains desirable or undesirable criteria. The cited figure and section of the reference do not teach or suggest providing a list of extracting names from the search result each with links to documents related to the name. As such, the cited references fail to disclose all elements of the subject claim.

Moreover, independent claim 21 recites *at least one output presented on a display device to indicate user-dependent search query result information; the output utilizing, at least in part, a thumbnail view to convey the information, **the thumbnail view includes highlighting of relevant content in the at least one search query result**, the relevance based upon a current context of the user, the current user context is inferred based upon automated monitoring of actions relating to a task that the user is currently performing.* As conceded in the Office Action dated October 20, 2008, Kravets *et al.* and Gottsman *et al.*, are silent regarding a thumbnail view that includes highlighting of relevant content in the at least one search query result. Brown *et al.* is cited as making up for this deficiency of Kravets *et al.* and Gottsman *et al.* In particular, Figure 9, column 9, line 60 to column 10, line 10 and column 10, lines 30-45 of Brown *et al.* are cited. However, these sections merely disclose that the thumbnail image is given a colored border indicating if the linked document contains desirable or undesirable criteria. The subject claim provides a thumbnail view, wherein the relevant content is highlighted. For example, a thumbnail view of a linked document that has very little relevant content will show very little highlighting, while a thumbnail view of a linked document that has a lot of relevant content will show a lot of highlighting. Thus, a user can easily visually discern the relevance a document by the amount of highlighting shown in the thumbnail. The cited references do not teach or suggest a thumbnail view including highlighting of relevant content in the at least one search query result. Therefore, Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.* fail to teach all elements of the subject claim.

In view of at least the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations as recited in independent claims 1, 10, and 21 (and claims 2-9, 11-19, 22-25, and 27-29 that respectfully depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravets *et al.* (US 6,363,377) and Gottsman *et al.* (US 6,134,548) and Brown (US 6,405,192) and Nielson *et al.* (US 6,055,542). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, Brown *et al.*, and Nielson *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

Independent claim 20 recites *means for providing user-dependent query result information derived from the query result accepted by the client-side receiving component, **the user-dependent query result information includes an indication of percentage of the quantity of a single content type as compared to a total of all content within at least one linked document in the query result.*** Based upon the reasoning provided above with respect to claim 1, Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.* also fail to teach all limitations of claim 20. Furthermore, Nielson *et al.* fails to make up for the deficiencies of these references. Nielson *et al.* discloses a system for displaying information regarding web pages based upon a user interest profile. However, the cited reference is silent regarding a percentage indication providing a comparison of a particular content type against the total content of a linked document.

In view of at least the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, Brown *et al.*, and Nielson *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations as recited in independent claims 20, and thus fails to make obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP559US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Nilesh S. Amin/

Nilesh S. Amin

Reg. No. 58,407

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731